

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
11                   AT TACOMA

12                   POINT RUSTON, LLC, et al.,

13                   Plaintiffs,

14                   v.

15                   PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGIONAL  
16                   COUNCIL OF THE UNITED  
17                   BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS  
18                   AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, et al.,

19                   Defendants.

20                   CASE NO. C09-5232BHS

21                   ORDER GRANTING IN PART  
22                   PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO  
23                   COMPEL AND DENYING  
24                   DEFENDANT JOBS WITH  
25                   JUSTICE'S MOTION FOR  
26                   PROTECTIVE ORDER

27                   This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' motion to compel production of  
28 documents (Dkt. 95) and Defendant Jobs With Justice's ("JWJ") counter-motion for a  
protective order (Dkt. 101). The Court reserved final ruling on these motions pending  
JWJ's response to the Court's show cause order regarding the motions (Dkt. 132). JWJ  
filed its response to the show cause order (Dkt. 145). The Court has considered the  
pleadings filed in support of and in opposition to these motions, the response to the show  
cause order, and the remainder of the file and hereby grants in part Plaintiffs' motion to  
compel and denies JWJ's counter-motion for a protective order as discussed herein.

1

## **I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

2 On April 21, 2009, Plaintiffs filed their complaint against Defendants. Dkt. 1. On  
3 May 22, 2009, Defendants answered (Dkt. 20) and then filed an amended answer on May  
4 29, 2009. On June 17, 2009, the case was reassigned to the undersigned. Dkt. 32. On  
5 September 10, 2009, Plaintiffs filed a motion to compel production of documents. Dkt.  
6 79. On September 21, 2009, JWJ filed its response to this motion (Dkt. 83) and Plaintiffs  
7 replied on September 25, 2009 (Dkt. 88). On September 30, 2009, the Court denied  
8 Plaintiffs' motion to compel (Dkt. 79) but permitted renewal of the motion should it  
9 become necessary. Dkt. 90.

10 On October 27, 2009, Plaintiffs renewed their motion to compel production of  
11 documents (Dkt. 95) for which a response was filed on November 9, 2009 (Dkt. 109) and  
12 Plaintiffs replied on November 13, 2009 (Dkt. 117). On October 29, 2009, JWJ filed a  
13 countermotion for protective order (Dkt. 101) regarding the same materials in Plaintiffs'  
14 motion to compel (Dkt. 95). On November 9, 2009, Plaintiffs filed a response to the  
15 counter-motion for protective order (Dkt. 106), and on November 13, 2009, JWJ replied  
16 (Dkt. 111).

17 On December 18, 2009, the Court entered a preliminary order on these motions  
18 (Dkts. 95 and 101). Dkt. 132. In that order, the Court ordered JWJ to show cause why  
19 certain of these documents should be protected under the work product doctrine. On  
20 January 12, 2010, JWJ filed its response to the show cause order. Dkt. 144 (supporting  
21 this response with the Declaration of Jacob Carton, Dkt. 145).

22

## **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

23 This matter arises out of a general construction contractors' allegations that the  
24 Defendants engaged in secondary boycott activities and engaged in several state law  
25 violations, to include such illegal activity as trespass and defamation. See generally Dkt.  
26 76 (setting out detailed factual record). This Court has jurisdiction over the secondary  
27 boycott claim based on federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and over the  
28

1 supplemental state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367. See Dkt. 56 (discussing the  
2 jurisdictional basis of this case).

3 The instant matter before the court concerns one issue for which the Court deferred  
4 ruling on until JWJ responded to the Court's show cause order. Dkt. 132 at 11. That issue  
5 is whether or not the documents sought by Plaintiffs should be protected under the work  
6 product doctrine, as argued for by Defendants. *See, e.g., id.*

### 7 III. DISCUSSION

8 The work product doctrine is codified in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(3).  
9 Pursuant to the doctrine, documents and tangible things prepared by or for a party, or the  
10 party's representative, in anticipation of litigation are protected from discovery. *See In re*  
11 *Grand Jury Subpoena*, 357 F.3d 900, 906 (9th Cir. 2004). A representative of a party  
12 includes the party's attorney, consultant, or agent. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3).*

13 [T]o qualify for protection against discovery under Rule 26(b)(3),  
14 documents must have two characteristics: (1) they must be "prepared in  
15 anticipation of litigation or for trial," and (2) they must be "prepared by or  
for [the] party [seeking the protection] or by or for that . . . party's  
representative."

16 *In re Grand Jury Subpoena*, 357 F.3d at 907 (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3)) (citations  
17 omitted).

18 Where an objection to discovery requests on the basis of the work product doctrine  
19 is made, the objecting party must supply a privilege log that details all such documents.  
20 The burden of proof lies with the proponent of the privilege and each document must be  
21 tested against the adequacy of the party's privilege log and supporting material. The log  
22 should conform to the guidelines set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See,*  
23 *e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)*, advisory committee notes to 1993 amendments ("the party  
24 must provide sufficient information to enable other parties to evaluate the applicability of  
25 the claimed privilege or protection").

26 "When there is a true independent purpose for creating a document, *work product*  
27 *protection is less likely*, but when two purposes are profoundly interconnected, the

1 analysis is more complicated.” *In re Grand Jury Subpoena*, 357 F.3d at 908 (emphasis  
2 added). Documents may be protected by the work product doctrine if, “taking into  
3 account the facts surrounding their creation, their litigation purpose so permeates any  
4 non-litigation purpose that the two purposes cannot be discretely separated from the  
5 factual nexus as a whole.” *Id.* at 910. Stated differently, even if a document has some  
6 purpose other than for litigation or trial, the document is protected as work product if it is  
7 substantially infused with litigation purpose. *See id.*

8 Previously the Court ordered JWJ to show cause on how the work product doctrine  
9 applied to the particular documents at issue. Dkt. 132. In the show cause order, the Court  
10 informed JWJ that it was inclined to grant Plaintiffs’ motion to compel “unless JWJ can  
11 be more focused in establishing with some particularity why or how these documents are  
12 actually work product . . . .” Dkt. 132 at 10. In the show cause order, the Court noted that  
13 the privilege log did not adequately describe the documents that Defendants sought to  
14 withhold under the work product doctrine.

15 Plaintiffs responded to the show cause order. Dkt. 144. This response is supported  
16 by declaration. Dkt. 145, Declaration of Jacob Carton (Carton Decl.). Mr. Carton explains  
17 in his declaration why JWJ believes certain documents sought by Plaintiffs are subject to  
18 work product protections. *See* Carton Decl. ¶¶ 1-6. Mr. Carton states that these documents  
19 were prepared in anticipation of litigation. The documents that Mr. Carton is referring to  
20 are Bates Nos. 6753-6755, 6756-57, 6759-6766, 6849-52, 6906, 7098, 7111, 7132-33,  
21 7172-7173. Carton Decl. ¶ 5 (JWJ’s privilege log detailing the nature of each of these  
22 documents).

23 JWJ’s privilege log, embedded in the Carton Declaration, supports the Court’s  
24 preliminary conclusion (Dkt. 132 at 10-11) that these documents were not actually  
25 prepared in anticipation of litigation. At most, these documents may have been prepared  
26 with the dual purpose of coordinating free speech activities and in anticipation of  
27 litigation with Plaintiffs. *See, e.g.*, Carton Decl. ¶ 5. As an example, in describing these  
28

1 documents, JWJ claims the documents were given to counsel for “legal vetting” but that  
2 the documents were prepared by JWJ for determining, among other things, “methods to  
3 deliver free speech message” and to “draft prose to illustrate potential free speech.” JWJ  
4 appears to propose the following rule: once litigation is anticipated, a party need only  
5 pass documents created for other purposes by their attorney for “legal vetting” in order to  
6 have the documents protected as work product. This is not the rule. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P.  
7 26(b)(3).

8 Even if the Court found that these documents served a true dual purpose, the  
9 documents are only able to be protected when, “taking into account the facts surrounding  
10 their creation, their litigation purpose so permeates any non-litigation purpose that the  
11 two purposes cannot be discretely separated from the factual nexus as a whole.” *In re*  
12 *Grand Jury Subpoena*, 357 F.3d at 910. JWJ has not shown such infusion between these  
13 documents. Moreover, JWJ has not provided authority for the proposition that the work  
14 product doctrine protects documents created after they anticipated litigation, provided,  
15 however, the documents are passed by counsel for “legal vetting.”

16 On the other hand, JWJ asserts attorney-client privilege with respect to some  
17 words written on certain documents, Bates Nos. 6906, 7098, 7111, and 7132-33. To the  
18 extent these words represent communications between JWJ and its counsel, they are  
19 subject to the attorney-client privilege and may be redacted as such.

20 Because the Court is not persuaded by JWJ’s argument for complete protection of  
21 the documents with Bates Nos. 6753-6755, 6756-57, 6759-6766, 6849-52, 6906, 7098,  
22 7111, 7132-33, 7172-7173, the Court concludes these documents are to be disclosed  
23 within eight days of this order and may only be redacted for attorney-client privilege or  
24 first-amendment privilege consistent with the Court’s prior ruling (Dkt. 132).

25  
26  
27  
28

### **III. ORDER**

Therefore, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that, as discussed herein, Plaintiffs' motion to compel (Dkt. 95) is **GRANTED** in part; JWJ's motion for protective order (Dkt. 101) is **DENIED**; and JWJ must disclose the relevant documents within eight days of this order.

DATED this 18th day of February, 2010.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**BENJAMIN H. SETTLE**  
United States District Judge